	Case 1:23-cv-00526-KES-SAB	Document 48	Filed 04/15/25	Page 1 of 3			
1							
2							
3							
4							
5							
6							
7							
8	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT						
9	EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA						
10							
11	LAWRENCE CHRISTOPHER S	MITH, No	o. 1:23-cv-00526-K	ES-SAB (PC)			
12	Plaintiff,		FINDINGS AND RECO RECOMMENDING PLA				
13	v.	FC	OR CHANGE OF V	ENUE AND MOTION			
14	SECRETARY, et al.,		FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT BE DENIED (ECF No. 47)				
15	Defendants.						
16							
17	Plaintiff is proceeding pro se and in forma pauperis in this action filed pursuant to 42						
18	U.S.C. § 1983.						
19	Currently before the Court is Plaintiff's motion for change of venue and motion for						
20	summary judgment, filed March 17, 2025. Plaintiff's motions should be denied.						
21	Plaintiff states that he seeks a transfer of this action pursuant to 28 U.S.C. ¶ 1404. Under						
22	¶ 1404(a), an action may be transferred, "for the convenience of parties and witnesses, in the						
23	interest of justice, a district court may transfer any civil action to any other district where it						
24	might have been brought." The ultimate determination is subject to the discretion of the court and						
25	must be made on a case-by-case basis. <u>Jones v. GNC Franchising, Inc.</u> , 211 F.3d 495, 498 (9th						
26	Cir. 2000). Here, Plaintiff states that he seeks to transfer the action to the "district court for the						
27	District of Columbia circuit where I will throw myself at the mercy upon the kitty's." (ECF No.						
28	47 at 3.) Thus, Plaintiff has not provided an adequate basis to transfer this action and his motion						
		1					

Case 1:23-cv-00526-KES-SAB Document 48 Filed 04/15/25 Page 2 of 3

should be denied.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

Plaintiff also attaches a motion for summary judgment in support of his claim that the action should be transferred. Any motion for summary judgment is premature. The Court has not yet found that Plaintiff has stated a cognizable claim for relief, no Defendant has been ordered service, discovery as not yet commenced, and Defendants have not had an opportunity to pursue discovery. See, e.g., Baker v. German, No. 1:16-cv-01873-AWI-SAB (PC), 2017 WL 531937, at *1 (E.D. Cal. Feb. 9, 2017) (recommending summary judgment be denied where complaint not yet screened and service of complaint not yet authorized), recommendation adopted 2017 WL 1427028 (E.D. Cal. Apr. 21, 2017); see also Dews v. County of Kern, No. 14-16423, 599 Fed. App'x 681, 682 (9th Cir. Mar. 27, 2015) (finding district court properly denied Dews's motions for summary judgment as premature because a court must first screen a prisoner's complaint); Williams v. Yuan Chen, No. S-10-1292 CKD P, 2011 WL 4354533, at * 3 (E.D. Cal. Sept. 16, 2011) (denying plaintiff's summary judgment motion as premature where defendant had not yet filed an answer and the court had not issued a discovery order); Moore v. Hubbard, No. CIV S-06-2187 FCD EFB P, 2009 WL 688897, at *1 (E.D. Cal. Mar. 13, 2009) (recommending that prediscovery motion for summary judgment be denied as premature); Vining v. Runyon, 99 F.3d 1056, 1058 (11th Cir. 1996) ("A premature decision on summary judgment impermissibly deprives the [defendants] of their right to utilize the discovery process to discover the facts necessary to justify their opposition to the motion"). Consequently, Plaintiff's motion for summary judgment is premature and must be denied.

Accordingly, it is HEREBY RECOMMENDED that:

 Plaintiff's motion for change of venue and motion for summary judgment be DENIED.

These Findings and Recommendations will be submitted to the United States District Judge assigned to the case, pursuant to the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(l). Within **fourteen** (14) days after being served with these Findings and Recommendations, the parties may file written objections with the Court, limited to 15 pages in length, including exhibits. The document should be captioned "Objections to Magistrate Judge's Findings and

	Case 1:23-cv-00526-KES-SAB D	ocument 48	Filed 04/15/25	Page 3 of 3
1	Recommendations." The parties are	advised that fail	ure to file objection	ns within the specified
2	time may result in the waiver of right	s on appeal. W	ilkerson v. Wheele	<u>r</u> , 772 F.3d 834, 838-39
3	(9th Cir. 2014) (citing <u>Baxter v. Sulli</u>	<u>van</u> , 923 F.2d 1	391, 1394 (9th Cir.	. 1991)).
4				
5	IT IS SO ORDERED.		Sull	17
6	Dated: April 15, 2025	-	July N.	Lase
7			ANLEY A. BOON ited States Magistr	
8				
9				
10				
11				
12				
13				
14				
15				
16				
17				
18				
19				
20				
21				
22				
23				
24				
25				
26				
27				